

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 5, 7, 9-10, and 12-25 are pending in the application.

The Office action rejects claims 5, 7, 9-10, 12-21, and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Venkatraman et al. (USP 6,139,177, hereinafter Venkatraman) and Tan et al. (USPA 2001/0045451, hereinafter Tan). The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The combination of Venkatraman and Tan does not teach or suggest an appliance that transmits a device identifier to a relay server, receives a profile address from the relay server, and receives user preferences that are located at the profile address, as claimed in claim 5, upon which claims 18-20 depend.

The combination of Venkatraman and Tan does not teach or suggest a method that includes receiving first access data from a first remote device, the first access data providing network access to first configuration data corresponding to a first set of user preferences, receiving first configuration data via the network access, and configuring the appliance to a first configuration in accordance with the first configuration data, as claimed in claim 9, upon which claims 7, 10, 12-13, 21-25 depend.

The combination of Venkatraman and Tan does not teach or suggest a method that includes receiving an address of a relay server from a remote device, receiving a profile address from the relay server, and receiving user preference data from a profile server corresponding to the profile address, and controlling the appliance in accordance with the user preference data, as claimed in claim 14, upon which claims 15-17 depend.

Because the combination of Venkatraman and Tan does not teach the elements of the applicant's independent claims, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claims 5, 7, 9-10, 12-21, and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Venkatraman and Tan.

The Office action rejects claims 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Vankatraman, Tan, and Hanco et al. (USP 6,912,578, hereinafter Hanco). The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 22-23 are dependent upon claim 9, and the Office action relies on the combination of Vankatraman and Tan for teaching the elements of claim 9. As noted above, the combination of Vankatraman and Tan does not teach the elements of claim 9. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

In view of the foregoing, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application to be in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert M. McDermott/
Robert M. McDermott, Esq.
Reg. 41,508
804-493-0707

Please direct all correspondence to:

Corporate Counsel
U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001